

## REMARKS

Applicant hereby requests further examination of the subject application in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

Examiner restricted the application to one of the following inventions:

- Group I – claims 1-7
- Group II – claim 8
- Group III – claims 9-18.

Applicant hereby confirms the election of Group III, claims 9-18.

Examiner further restricted Group III to the following species:

- Electrophoresis media (claims 11-12)
- Catalyst (claims 13-14)
- Ion exchange resin (claims 15-16)
- Electronic device (claims 17-18)

Examiner and applicant concur that claims 9-10 are generic. Applicant hereby confirms the election of electrophoresis media (claims 9-12).

Applicant has canceled all of the original claims and has presented new claims 19 and 20 in order to properly define and distinguish applicant's invention from the prior art while maintaining conformity with the specification. New claim 19 incorporates all of the limitations from canceled claims 9 and 11 which are supported in the specification and which are free of other deficiencies. Applicant also included a Markush group including non-elected species that are supported in the specification. New claim 20 incorporates all of the further limitations from canceled claim 12.

In a first rejection, Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C 102(c) as being anticipated by Wehrspohn. Applicant has cancelled claims 9 and 10, and has not presented any new claims as exact replacements therefor. Therefore the first rejection is regarded as moot and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the first rejection.

In a second rejection, Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C 112, as being indefinite. Examiner cited the term “enhanced properties” because there are no reference values therefor. Applicant has cancelled claims 9, 10, and 11 and has not presented any limitation containing the term “enhanced properties” in the new claims. Therefore the rejection is regarded as moot and applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the second rejection.

Examiner objected to claims 11 and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten claims 11 and 12 as new claims 19 and 20, in accordance with the examiners requirement. Applicant omitted the “enhanced properties” limitation due to the indefinite nature of the limitation. Moreover, the language of the new claims has been modified from the original in order to properly define and distinguish applicant’s invention from the prior art while maintaining conformity with the specification. The objection being overcome applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claims 19 and 20.

Examiner required new drawings in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) because photographs 3b-3d were not clear. Applicant has submitted herewith a complete set of new, fully compliant drawings prepared by a competent draftsman.

Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of claims 19-20, and the issue of U.S. letters patent therefor. Applicant has made every effort to present claims which clearly distinguish over the cited art, and it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. However, applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned (direct line (865) 574-4178) if anything further is required by the Examiner prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Joseph A. Marasco/  
Joseph A. Marasco  
Patent Agent of Record  
Reg. No. 32,798  
UT-Battelle, LLC  
P.O. Box 2008  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-6258  
(865) 574-4178